**Questions to Encourage Critical Thinking (Nyaya)**

**1. Means of [gaining] Valid Knowledge: (This relates to awareness, and there are four subdivisions.)**

*Perception*

How do you perceive the situation being discussed?

Do you agree with the way the author or speaker perceives the situation? Why or why not?

*Inference (that which is assumed based on perception)*

What basic inferences have been made? Are there any missing?

*Comparison (higher order perception, relating one thing to another: differences and similarities)*

Do other experts on this topic express the same opinions? Why or why not?

(If appropriate) how does what has been expressed compare with your own experience?

*Verbal testimony*

How coherently do the writers or speakers express themselves?

Have others come out to agree or disagree?

**2. Objects[s] of Valid Knowledge [source [s] of information]**

What sources do the writers or speakers cite to support their views?

What sources would you use to support or refute their words?

**3. Doubt (possible contradictions)**

Do you have any doubts about the points of view being expressed? Why or why not?

Will others have doubts about the points of view expressed? Why or why not?

**4. Purpose (a plan or strategy to resolve doubts.)**

If you have doubts, how do you plan to resolve them?

If you have no doubts, how do you plan to use the information that you agree with?

If you agree with the information and were called upon to support it, how would you do so?

If you do not agree and were called upon to refute the stand taken, how would you do so?

**5. Example(s) (verbal illustrations)**

If the writer or speaker used examples, are they good ones. Why or why not?

What examples can you think of that either support or contradict the point of view of the writers or speakers?

**6. Established Principle (basic law[s] of Nature that support our logic)**

What principles of SCI come to mind when reading or listening?

Does the material that is being presented support them? Why or why not?

**7. Parts of a Logical Argument (Testing the logical progression)**

Is the logic in the material being presented easy to follow? Why or why not?

**8. Process of Reasoning**

Can you trace the process of reasoning that the writer or speaker used to structure his or her argument?

What criteria would you use to test the soundness of the reasoning?

**9. Art of Drawing Conclusions** (**putting everything together and drafting a conclusion)**

Do you agree with the writer or speaker’s conclusions?

What conclusions have you drawn yourself after reading or listening?

**10. Discussion (putting forth various views in order to assess aspects of an argument from different angles)**

What other angles could one take on this topic? Is it possible to harmonize all of the angles and come up with a more expanded conclusion?

**11. Polemics (arguments for the sake of victory, not for the sake of truth)**

Is this present in the writer or speakers presentation on the topic. Why or why not?

**12. Cavil (that which lowers the dignity of another)**

Does the writer or speaker lower the dignity of the topic or people related to the topic?

If so, what does that do to the argument or presentation of facts?

**13. Fallacies (This refers to inadequate reasoning, and there are five types)**

*Inconclusive (when there is more than one conclusion that can be formed from an argument)*

Is there more than one conclusion that one can form from the writer or speakers presentation?

If not, why not?

If so, why?

*Contradictory (points that contradict each other.)*

Did you find yourself confused at any point because some of the points presented contradicted each other?

If so give examples, and explain why the points contradict each other.

*Equivalent to the question (circular reasoning that doesn’t really go anywhere; it just raises the same question)*

Did you find yourself confused at any point because the reasoning did not seem to go anywhere and seemed to raise the same question it was trying to answer?

*Unproved (having no precedents that support the thesis)*

Are there any precedents that support the writer or speaker’s thesis?

If so what are they?

If not, what kind would you expect to be there?

*Belated (not workable in the present timeframe)*

Are the ideas presented workable in the present timeframe?

If so, why?

If not, why not?

**14. Equivocation (using vague, ambiguous or misleading language)**

Is any of the language used vague, ambiguous, or misleading?

If yes, give examples and explain your choices.

*Verbal (using words that do not represent the meaning originally intended for them)*

Are there any words used incorrectly?

If yes, give examples and explain your choices.

*Generalizing (moving too quickly to a conclusion on the basis of incomplete evidence in order to mask the real issue)*

Is the evidence given for the stand the writer or speaker is taking complete?

Justify your answer with examples.

*Figurative (using a word that is not meant to be taken literally)*

Is there any figurative language (metaphors, similes) used inappropriately?

If so, justify your answer with examples and explanations.

**15. Futile Argument (arguments based solely on similar and dissimilar characteristics)**

Do you see any basic flaws in the writer or speaker’s argument?

If so give examples.

If not, justify your answer.

**16. Disagreement on First Principle (ideas that do not reflect a complete understanding)**

Does the writer or speaker discuss the issue of consciousness?

If so, in what way?

If not, does this affect your appreciation of the points presented?

If not, explain why.

If so, explain why.